

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,436	03/31/2004	Kirti Srivastava	GRT/4062-117	3805
23117 NIXON & VA	7590 10/01/2007 NDERHVE PC	EXAMINER		
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR			DESTA, ELIAS	
ARLINGTON, VA 22203			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2857	
			т	
		·	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
•			10/01/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
		10/813,436	SRIVASTAVA ET AL.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Elias Desta	2857	
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHO WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as a soint of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period we to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status				
2a) <u></u> □	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>25 Ju</u> This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final.  nce except for formal matters, pro		
Dispositi	on of Claims			
5) □ 6) ፟ 7) □ 8) □ Applicati	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers  The specification is objected to by the Examine The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acceptable.	vn from consideration. r election requirement.	Examiner.	
11)[	Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
2) Notice 3) Infor	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) ter No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:	ate	

Art Unit: 2857

## Detailed Action

## Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's arguments (see remarks, filed 6/25/2007) with respect to the rejection of claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. 101 has been fully considered and is persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground of rejection is made in view of U.S. Patent 7,130,758.

## Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 2857

3. <u>Claims 1-10</u> are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 3 of <u>U.S. Patent No. 7,130,758</u>. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because:

In reference to claims 1 and 6: a process for creating an analytical closed form model of the earth's surface area heat flow and its error bounds by stochastic analysis so that the model can be used [for evaluation]. Claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758 is a method for obtaining closed form expression for surface temperature depth distribution along with error bounds. The heat flow in claim 1 of the instant application is equivalent to the surface temperature depth distribution noted in claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758. In claim 1 of the instant application, inputting values to a computer representing random thermal conductivity is equivalent to having or "incorporating random thermal conductivity" in claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758. Exponentially decreasing heat source and associated boundary conditions in claim 1 of the instant application are actually governed by equation 1 of  $\frac{d}{dz} \left\{ \overline{K} + K'(z) \frac{dT}{dz} \right\} = A(z)$  where A (z) is radiogenic heat source which is exponentially decreasing heat source and associated boundary conditions and the expression in {} represents thermal conductivity as well as an expression that associates boundary conditions to device a stochastic solution to the temperature field (see claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758). The solution to the differential equation (the stochastic heat conduction equation, as expressed in claim 1 of the instant application or noted in claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758) is found using a series expansion or other method would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter



Art Unit: 2857

pertains because both the instant claim 1 and claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758 includes outputting a solution to find a mean and variance in temperature fields.

Claims 2 and 3 of the instant application are anticipated by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758.  $\left\{\overline{K} + K'(z)\frac{dT}{dz}\right\}$ : In the equation K (z) is substituted for  $\overline{K} + K'(z)$ .

Claims 4 and 9 of the instant application are anticipated by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758 considering heat flow fields are equivalent to variance in temperature fields.

<u>Claims 5 and 10</u> of the instant application are anticipated by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758 since the equation noted in the claim provides expression for heat flow and the mean is simply the expectation (another term used in stochastic expressions).

Claim 7 of the instant application is equivalent to claim 3 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758.

Claim 8 of the instant application is anticipated by claim 1 of U.S. Patent 7,130,758. As noted earlier the equation  $-A(z) = \left\{\overline{K} + K'(z) \frac{dT}{dz}\right\}$ : In the equation K(z) is substituted for  $\overline{K} + K'(z)$ .

## Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elias Desta whose telephone number is (571)-272-2214. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Fri (10:30-7:00).

Art Unit: 2857

5.

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Eliseo Ramos-Feliciano can be reached on (571)-272-7925. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would

like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated

information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Elias Desta

Examiner

Art Unit 2857

- E.D.

- September 11, 2007